UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/064,105	06/11/2002	Michael W. Hawman	EH-10536	3029

30188 7590 02/23/2005

PRATT & WHITNEY
400 MAIN STREET
MAIL STOP: 132-13
EAST HARTFORD, CT 06108

EXAMINER	
JARRETT, RYAN A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2125	

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/064,105	HAWMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ryan A. Jarrett	2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-25,27,34-37 and 40-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,11-25,27,34-37 and 40-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1/27/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 1/27/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claim 2, Applicant argues that Aoki does not generate a "new tag", and then points to the fact that Aoki uses a rewritable task card. In Aoki, task related items are first printed on the rewritable card at the work slip issuing terminal (Fig. 3 #S1). Subsequently, at a reader/writer of a work terminal at a first work facility, **updated** task information is printed on the work slip (Fig. 3 #S5). Thus, the "updated task information" of Aoki constitutes the "new tag" claimed by the Applicant.

Regarding independent claims 1, 6, 23, 34, and 35, Applicant argues that Aoki does not describe or suggest the creation of routing information, and that the tag of Aoki does not comprise this routing information. However, Aoki prints the most recent updates of task details as needed on the work slip, "thus readily reflecting any changes in process flows and task details in the actual task instructions" ([0050]). Thus, the process flow of Aoki constitutes the "route" claimed by the Applicant, and this process flow is printed on the work slip of Aoki.

Regarding independent claim 11, Applicant states that Aoki describes a system that generates updated task details, but then argues, "Aoki neither discloses nor suggests that such updated task details are generated in light of part disposition". However, in Aoki, the task detail updates are searched and accessed based in part on

the applicable work facility in question, i.e. the part position or location (e.g., [0036], Fig. 3 #S4).

Regarding independent claims 12 and 36, Applicant argues that Aoki does not generate a task list specific to the work location. However, as mentioned above, the task detail updates are searched and accessed based in part on the applicable work facility in question (e.g., [0036], Fig. 3 #S4).

Regarding independent claim 37 as it relates to Aoki, Applicant argues, "Aoki neither describes nor suggests the modification of disposition information for a first part in response to disposition information for a second part." However, it is noted that this feature is not even positively recited in claim 37, and thus does not carry patentable weight. Claim 37 is also rejected by Madden.

Regarding independent claims 14 and 37, Applicant states, "While Madden prioritizes the delayed vehicle, the disposition of the other vehicle is not modified." However, the language of claim 14 only requires that the disposition of **one** part be adjusted, and this constitutes the prioritization of the delayed vehicle in Madden. For example, see col. 4 lines 45-54 of Madden.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 41 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 4. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is

proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-13, 17, 23, 24, 27, 34-37, 40, 42, 44, and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Aoki US 2001/0056310. For example, Aoki discloses a computerized method of tailoring work instructions to perform on a part, comprising the steps of: providing at least one computer having memory with global work instructions therein, said global work instructions relevant to a plurality of parts and to a plurality of work locations (e.g., [0036]); receiving part identifier information and work location information (e.g., Fig. 3 step S3); processing said part identifier information and said work location information (e.g., Fig. 3 step S4); and generating tailored work instructions from said computer responsive to said part identifier information and said work location information (e.g., Fig. 3 step S5); wherein a user reviews said tailored work instructions and performs said tailored work instructions accordingly (e.g., Fig. 3 step S6); wherein said processing step comprises searching

said global work instructions for tasks relevant to said part and said work location (e.g., Fig. 3 step S4); wherein said part identifier information includes a part number (e.g., [0043]).

5. Claims 14, 20, 21 and 37 (*additionally*) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Madden et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,516,239. Regarding claims 14, 20, and 21, Madden et al. discloses a computerized method of dispositioning of parts, comprising the steps of: providing at least one computer; receiving part identifier information for a first part; determining a disposition of said first part responsive to said first part identifier information; receiving part identifier information for a second part to said computer; determining a disposition of said second part responsive to said second part identifier; determining whether said second part disposition requires adjustment to said first part disposition; and if necessary, modifying said first part disposition (e.g., col. 4 lines 10-54); wherein a user reviews said first and second dispositions and dispositions said first and second parts accordingly (e.g., col. 15 lines 33-55, e.g., col. 16 lines 29-64, e.g., col. 22 line 47 – col. 23 line 17); wherein said part identifier information includes a part number and a serial number (e.g., col. 4 lines 29-51).

Regarding claim 37, Madden et al. discloses a computer system for dispositioning of parts, comprising: means for receiving part identifier information for a first part and a second part; and means for processing said first and second part identifier information to produce first and second part dispositions (e.g., col. 4 lines 10-54).

It is noted that the limitation "wherein said second part disposition may require adjustment to said first part disposition" in claim 37 carries no patentable weight.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4, 8, 18, 25, 41, 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki as applied to claims 3, 7, 12, 17, and 24 above, and further in view of Pappas U.S. Patent No. 6,338,045. Aoki does not explicitly disclose that the part identifier information includes a serial number. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a serial number on the parts of Aoki since Pappas discloses the use of serial numbers in an assembly and maintenance operation as a means of tracking the various parts in the operation (e.g., abstract).

8. Claims 15, 16, 19, 43, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoki as applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 11, and 12 above, and further in view of Pappas U.S. Patent No. 6,338,045. Aoki does not specifically disclose that the part is a "gas turbine engine part". However, Pappas discloses a method for managing and tracking activities and parts in an aircraft assembly and maintenance operation,

including jet engine parts (e.g., col. 5 lines 21-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Aoki with Pappas since Pappas teaches that it is desirable to track jet engine parts in an assembly or maintenance operation in order to help prevent the use of unapproved parts in aircraft (e.g., col. 1 line 10 – col. 2 line 3).

9. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madden et al. as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Pappas U.S. Patent No. 6,338,045. Madden et al. does not specifically disclose that the part is a "gas turbine engine part". However, Pappas discloses a method for managing and tracking activities and parts in an aircraft assembly and maintenance operation, including jet engine parts (e.g., col. 5 lines 21-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Madden et al. with Pappas since Pappas teaches that it is desirable to track jet engine parts in an assembly or maintenance operation in order to help prevent the use of unapproved parts in aircraft (e.g., col. 1 line 10 – col. 2 line 3).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ryan A. Jarrett whose telephone number is (571) 272-3742. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00-6:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on (571) 272-3749. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ryan A. Jarrett
Examiner
Art Unit 2125

2/19/05

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100